

locality's tax forgiveness as part of its one-third contribution of urban renewal costs and thus would stimulate the construction of low rent projects by State and city agencies in large metropolitan areas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1959.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: In accordance with your request, there is attached a draft bill to require the public disclosure of certain information with respect to proposed redevelopment in urban renewal areas. This information would have to be made public prior to the time the land involved is sold or leased by the local public agency.

As this Agency favors the full disclosure of the types of information covered in the draft bill, we have no objection to its enactment.

We have been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that this report is without objection insofar as the Bureau is concerned.

Sincerely yours,

NORMAN P. MASON,
Administrator.

A BILL TO AMEND TITLE I OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949 TO REQUIRE THAT CERTAIN INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT BE MADE PUBLIC

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(e) No understanding with respect to, or contract for, the disposition of land within an urban renewal area shall be entered into by a local public agency unless the local public agency shall have first made public, in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator, (1) the name of the redeveloper, together with the names of its officers and principal members, shareholders and investors, (2) the redeveloper's estimate of the cost of any residential redevelopment and rehabilitation and (3) the redeveloper's estimate of rentals and sales prices of any proposed housing involved in such redevelopment and rehabilitation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2351) to amend the Housing Act of 1949 with respect to public disclosure by redevelopers, State urban renewal assistance and payment for land used for low-rent housing, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT, DIVESTING THE OFFICE OF ALIEN PROPERTY OF VARIOUS COPYRIGHT AND TRADEMARK PROPERTIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. This bill proposes to return to its former owners, or their

successors in interest, certain property which is now administered by the Office of Alien Property and which consists of copyrights, trademarks and unexpired contract interests involving the same. The future income to be derived from the copyright, trademark and film properties dealt with in this bill is not substantial and will steadily decrease. Accordingly, enactment of this bill would not appreciably diminish the total amount of vested funds ultimately available to the administration.

This bill, if enacted, would effect a statutory divestment of the Government's title to these properties without any necessity for the filing of claims or any formal action by the former owners, and thus without the necessity of any administrative processing by any agency of the Government. The measure would also authorize the transfer of all vested motion-picture film prints to the Library of Congress for retention or disposition as the Library sees fit. The proposed legislation would not return the income received by the Office of Alien Property from any of the divested assets prior to the effective date of divestment.

The purpose of the bill is to bring to an end the administration of the above mentioned classes of vested property. In the absence of such legislation, the Government will be faced with the prospect of continuing the administration of such property for an indefinite period of time.

Early legislative action is, therefore, urged in order to accomplish a major step toward termination of the World War II alien property program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2354) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP ACT OF 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most pressing legislative needs of today is the complete revision and replacement of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 with a statute which conforms to our democratic traditions, our international declarations, and our concepts of fairness. There is no better time than now, during World Refugee Year, to rededicate ourselves to these ideals.

Former Senator Lehman, after an exhaustive study of this problem, introduced S. 1206 in the 84th Congress. Together with several of my distinguished colleagues, I cosponsored his bill. I have continued my interest in the task of a thorough and complete revision of our immigration and citizenship laws, and I introduce today on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], a proposed Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1959 which would supplant the grossly inadequate 1952 act.

This bill seeks to modernize the antiquated concepts and prejudices of an

isolationist America formed prior to World War II and retained in our present immigration and nationality laws. Seven major objectives are met by this proposed revision.

First. The bill discards the national origin system, the selection of immigrants according to tests of racial ancestry or place of birth. We cannot remain true to the democratic principles of the Declaration of Independence nor to our United Nations espousal of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that people are to be treated equally without regard to race, national origin or place of birth, and at the same time disregard such basic tenets in our immigration and nationality laws. Human beings should be judged upon the basis of their inherent worth. Ancestor worship and the worship of national origins should be eradicated from our immigration statutes. My proposed bill would modernize the quota system and establish a numerical limitation upon the basis of one-sixth of 1 percent of the most recent population census. This quota would be allocated without regard to national origin, race, color, or creed. Preferences under the quota would be allocated to reunite families, to bring needed skills to the United States, and to accord asylum to refugees.

Second. The proposed Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1959 would incorporate the fair procedures into our immigration and nationality problems which Congress has found so necessary for other administrative agencies. I refer to the Administrative Procedure Act. The people of our Nation have been repeatedly shocked and chagrined by arbitrary immigration procedures which hark back to the deportation delirium of the 1920's. Strict enforcement of our immigration laws can and should be accomplished within the framework and limitations of a fair code of administrative justice as outlined by the Administrative Procedure Act. Other provisions designed to bring reasonable standards and fairness into immigration procedures are provisions for a statute of limitations, requirements that only record evidence be considered at hearings—with rare exceptions—and the elimination of determinations based on personal opinions of administrative officials.

Third. The proposed bill would eliminate the unnecessary duplication which exists today in the administration of our immigration laws. There is no justification for two coordinate branches of our Government—the State Department and the Department of Justice—to maintain separate staffs and to adjudicate immigration cases each independent of the other. To streamline the process and to completely modernize it, the bill proposes a single independent agency, to be known as the Immigration and Naturalization Commission, with three members who would supervise and control all the immigration functions now divided into the State and Justice Departments. The bill also provides for a statutory Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals. The principle underlying these proposals have the approval of the American Bar Association.

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11867

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BIBLE, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted a resolution (S. Res. 142) establishing the Select Committee on Civil Defense, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO PUBLIC DISCLOSURE BY REDEVELOPERS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a housing bill containing a key antisecrecy amendment to the Housing Act of 1949 which would affect all title I projects under the Federal urban renewal program. It would require full public disclosure by redevelopers of all pertinent information as to the prospective sponsors, rental and sales costs, and type of new construction planned on title I sites before any agreement or contract can be made by the public agency concerned.

This amendment has been reviewed and found unobjectionable by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and by the Bureau of the Budget. In addition to checking it out with the administration, I have also informed the New York City administration about this proposed amendment and I am satisfied that it will find the amendment advantageous, too.

It will not discourage sponsorship of title I projects, and this is evidenced by a letter published in the New York Times of today, written by Lewis Whiteman, executive director of the Investment Builders Association, Inc., which reads as follows:

The members of this association, who include most of the leading private investment builders of this city, are pleased and encouraged by your public announcement today that you will take steps to strengthen and improve the administration of the city's title I program.

Although the greatest sources of private investment capital and construction experience are to be found right here in New York City, it is significant that there has been no overwhelming rush by reputable builders to get into the slum-clearance program.

Many builders are lukewarm about it because the notion persists that under current procedures it's all pretty cut and dried in advance as to which sponsor gets the job.

The inference that any one sponsor is favored may be a blatant lie. And yet the most effective way to dispel unfounded suspicions of this kind, and to remove the general attitude of hostility which most builders have toward the program, is to make free and open bidding a reality, and not a mere pretachment.

It is not a question of how legal these local procedures may be, or how righteous their intent. The fact remains that, at the very least, they have had the effect of restricting the program to a privileged few who have been able to dig in behind a fortified line—while at the same time they have erected some very real, even though unintended, bar-

riers against other outside potential sponsors.

DISCLOSURES ARE CITED

Reputable builders will not be attracted to any program which creates even the slightest suspicion of being operated as a closed club. Such suspicions, however unfounded they may be, have been quickened by title I disclosures during the past few weeks.

In writing this letter, we are not trying to cast anyone in the role of public villain. We happen to believe that the title I program is still a good one, and we do not want to see it sabotaged by doubt, misunderstanding or uncertainty.

In terms of the public good, the advantages of wide and free competition are too self-evident to be debated. In this view, I feel certain that many of the member firms of this association would be very much interested in sponsoring title I projects, if they can be assured of bidding for them on a free and open competitive basis.

We hope that in your efforts to strengthen and improve the functions of the slum clearance committee, some consideration may be given to revising its procedures so as to widen the zone of competition for title I sponsors.

Mr. President, my proposal would serve a distinct need in helping to clarify local procedures regarding urban renewal projects to be built.

The bill also contains a provision which would encourage the construction of low cost public housing projects on urban renewal sites, and a section which would establish a priority for urban renewal projects in States willing to invest 50-50 in the local share of such programs. In a State like New York which has a \$25 million fund allotted for slum clearance, passage of this provision could more than double the amount available in local contributions for Federal title I projects.

The future of slum clearance and urban renewal not only in New York but in every community throughout the Nation must be protected insofar as we can manage it against the kind of accusations, charges and countercharges now being aired in New York City by requiring public disclosure of the necessary facts regarding the sponsors and the plans of title I project developers. Since public moneys and public agencies are intimately concerned in the redevelopment of such sites, it is properly Congress that should order such full disclosure. The amendment I am introducing today to eliminate secrecy regarding these developments is similar to a proposal originally introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative JOHN LINDSAY, Republican of New York, and specifically provides as follows:

No understanding with respect to, or contract for, the disposition of land within an urban renewal area shall be entered into by a local public agency unless the local public agency shall have first made public, in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator (1) the name of the redeveloper, together with the names of its officers and principal members, shareholders and investors, (2) the redeveloper's estimate of the cost of any residential redevelopment and rehabilitation and (3) the redeveloper's estimate of rentals and sale prices of any proposed housing involved in such redevelopment and rehabilitation.

The difficulty is that as a practical matter effective public disclosure is now a matter of local option and there are no requirements that all the specific information called for by my bill be made available publicly.

Such an amendment should provide the citizens in the more than 400 communities already planning urban renewal programs and the hundreds more that may start such programs with some assurance at least that personal and political friendships may not be determining factors in awarding urban renewal project contracts.

I wish to state, too, that progress made under the decade-old urban renewal program in New York City has been outstanding, and it is in no sense a "dead duck"—it still is and will remain very much alive with an infusion of new Federal urban renewal funds. I have protested the veto of the housing bill and have in the course of that debate developed acceptance here in the Senate of the proposition that we must pass a housing bill at this session. There is just no money in the till for title I projects now. The \$25 to \$30 million not committed is needed for possible emergency increases on title I projects already committed. In the case of the Federal urban renewal program, we have an example of a type of Government spending which stimulates \$5 in productive private investment for every \$1 spent by the Federal Government. As a matter of hard fact, our Urban Renewal projects act as a potent counter-inflationary force. In New York City, which has the biggest urban renewal operation in the entire country, Federal capital grants of \$92 million to 13 substantially completed projects are generating \$423 million in private investment, which approximates the national ratio of 5 to 1, private as compared to Federal expenditures.

New York City averages about 12 percent of new Federal money made available under title I having received so far about \$156 million in grant reservations for 26 projects either in execution or planning out of \$1,321 million of Federal money available for title I projects.

The final provision in the legislation would put State and local public housing projects on a parity with Federal public housing projects. Surveys have repeatedly shown it is often most desirable that the low income families originally living in slum sites be relocated in low cost public housing developments built where their old tenements once stood. The remaining major problems in urban renewal are just relocation policies for residents and small businessmen on the site and a fair amount of public housing for displaced low income families.

At the present time, urban renewal projects which have average room rentals of \$40 and higher are often constructed on these slum sites because local financed public housing projects require a double contribution by the city in terms of granting a tax exemption on the property and contributing one-third of the cost of buying, clearing, and disposing of the land for the urban renewal site. My proposed change would allow the HHFA Administrator to count the

1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11869

Fourth. The bill would eliminate some of the cruel injustices of the present law. Deserving aliens with family ties in the United States would not be deported. Single aliens who had established themselves here and have good records will no longer be subjected to exile and banishment.

Fifth. The bill would eliminate the statutory discriminations between native-born and naturalized citizens. Under the proposed bill, a naturalized person who acquires citizenship in good faith will no longer be a second-class citizen but will have the same right to travel and stay abroad as a native-born citizen. The bill will also eliminate the present unsubstantial grounds for the denial or revocation of citizenship.

Sixth. The bill would establish a statutory review procedure in all cases involving loss of citizenship, deportation, exclusion, and denial of visas.

Finally, the bill would provide reasonable standards for exclusion and deportation of aliens and for loss of citizenship.

Included are adequate safeguards to prevent the admission of aliens who have advocated or taught subversive doctrines or have been members of such subversive organizations as the Communist or Nazi parties; the categories of aliens to be barred under these provisions are carefully defined.

The 1952 Immigration and Nationality Act lacks clarity, simplicity, fair standards, freedom from discrimination, and regard for human rights. It has been the subject of numerous piecemeal amendments in an effort to achieve some of these desired qualities. The full accomplishment of this desired goal can only be accomplished by a complete revision. To this end I have introduced the Immigration and Citizenship Act of 1959.

The enactment of this bill will make the World Refugee Year a historical accomplishment and will signal to the whole world our rededication to the service of mankind and a life of freedom for all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Thursday of next week, in order that other Senators who have expressed an interest in the bill may have an opportunity to join as cosponsors if they so desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk until Thursday of next week, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask consent of the Senator to add my name as a cosponsor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very pleased, Mr. President, to ask that the name of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONFERENCE TO REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on it in excess of the 3 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Montana may proceed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for a conference on measures to reduce unemployment and employ the growing labor force. In this I am pleased to be joined by my esteemed colleagues, Senators GRUENING, McCARTHY, McGEE, MORSE, MOSS, NEUBERGER, and YOUNG of Ohio.

The recent recovery from recession demonstrates the need for the passage of this joint resolution. While unemployment has disappeared as the headline story from the front pages of our newspapers, it persists. Continuing hard core unemployment refuses to disappear even when production rises. The failure of a prosperous economy to employ all new entrants to the labor force is among the most difficult to solve of all our economic problems. Strictly in human terms, we need to put our best efforts into finding the causes for such unemployment and applying the remedies.

Whole communities are being affected by the blight of continuing unemployment. Expanding industries are making high profits, but as they grow and prosper they do so without employing a correspondingly larger number of workers. The degree of recovery already achieved from the trough of the recession that hit us in the fall of 1957, and which has cost us some \$35 billion in lost gross national product, is taking place without employing our full labor force. Nor is there any evidence that, when we are again on the highroad of full recovery, our economy will provide jobs for all those able to and seeking work.

We do not believe that any laws enacted by this Congress could by themselves, insure the achievement of the goal of full employment in the face of mounting automation and new labor-saving technologies. This is not a problem for lawmakers alone to solve. It is a situation confronting all the various elements that make up our society. But the Congress can accomplish a great deal by furnishing the leadership, and providing the means of bringing together the responsible representatives of management, organized labor, the Government, farmers, consumers, and experts in labor force economics.

I am not one whose record shows him rushing forward at the least opportunity asking that a special committee be set up to do some emergency job. I am well aware of the need for proper organization of the legislative branch and respect highly the work and prerogatives of our standing committees. But on rare occasions, it becomes necessary to focus special attention on a problem, to

bring it forcefully before the people, to devote extraordinary effort of our best minds to assemble and appraise the facts and arrive at workable conclusions. The continuing and growing unemployment and our failure to employ all our labor force under present conditions and hours worked is just such an occasion when the problem needs the exclusive treatment of a group organized for that one purpose.

Let us establish at once the need of examining this problem of unemployment just now, at the very time production is rising, plants are expanding and new demand for labor is showing itself along a wide front. The official Government figures show that statistical unemployment has dropped from 5.2 million in March 1958 to 3.4 million in May 1959, a drop of about 35 percent. Employment in nonagricultural establishments advanced in the same interval from 49.7 million to 52 million, a gain of more than 4 percent. Despite this most encouraging improvement, the overall employment and unemployment situation is not encouraging, and the outlook does not offer any basis for complacency. We cannot afford to ignore any longer such basic facts as the following:

The Bureau of the Census estimates indicate that the labor force will increase from 1955 to 1975 at an accelerated rate; by 860,000 a year between 1955 and 1960; and by 1,440,000 a year in the last 5-year period, 1970 to 1975. Just now, the yearly gain in the number employed or seeking work must be close to a million persons.

The monthly labor market surveys issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, taken by the sampling method, give us a different picture. They indicate that from May 1958 to May 1959, the labor force had increased by only 400,000. This would mean that in comparison with the anticipated increase in the labor force some 600,000 workers seem to have retired from the labor force. These are probably people on the borderline between employment and unemployment, people who have ceased to look for jobs which they cannot find. Here is the source of the hidden unemployment which makes the monthly labor market statistics less reliable than they should be. If these people are included in the unemployed, the total for May 1959 would mount to 4 million, thereby cutting the number of workers who have regained their jobs in the recovery period to 1.4 million, or less if the seasonal factor is considered.

We have now lived through three successive and costly postwar recessions, and they have been an important cause of growing unemployment. Taking comparable periods of recovery from the low point of each recession, what do we find? Fourteen months after the 1949 recession low point, unemployment was slightly less than 2 million; after the 1954 low point of the second recession, unemployment was higher, 2.5 million. After the current recession, in May of this year, there were at least 3.4 and probably closer to 4 million unemployed.

11870

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 9

The trend, both in periods of prosperity and of recession, has been the same—an increase in unemployment with the passage of time. Experts say that this is not a phenomenon of the business cycle but can only be accounted for by structural changes taking place in our economy. I don't profess to know but I am sure you will agree with me that if we are facing the prospect of growing unemployment over the years ahead, we had better learn all we can about this problem which is so vital to our national defense, to the health of our Nation, and to the welfare of our people.

I have had firsthand acquaintance with this problem, both in the State of Montana and in the Senate, where for years I was a member of and then chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am aware of the splendid work of the Joint Economic Committee in the study of employment, growth, and price stabilization. I am likewise familiar with the unemployment resolution passed by the Senate following the emergency conference of the AFL-CIO last April, which rests in the House of Representatives not acted upon. There are several agencies in the executive branch charged with the responsibility of studying and reporting on labor force problems. With these several avenues of study of unemployment available, why do we need this particular joint resolution?

This joint resolution would bring about a long needed coordination of presently separate and independent efforts. It would focus national attention on an aggravating problem of great importance to our welfare. It would do this with the greatest economy of time and effort.

This problem of unemployment and its relation to hours of work is not an emergency matter. Nor can it be deferred for long, as every day's delay in finding the solution is so much costly time wasted. This problem requires careful consideration by all parties directly affected—the Congress, the executive branch, labor, management, farmer, and consumer groups. They need the help of the labor force experts. The conference method proposed is conducive to developing the facts.

The official character and broad mandate of this conference will assure a public forum for discussion and facilitate agreement on action to be taken. Although much of that action might not be embodied in law, the desired results may come about by the understanding and cooperation between labor and management which this conference could engender. For instance, if a reduction in the normal workweek turns out to be the agreed method reestablishing an equilibrium between supply of labor and demand for it, this might be accomplished by a provision in the collective bargaining agreements between management and labor. But the Government, as the largest single employer of labor, could assume leadership in establishing this new labor standard.

The Congress might consider, in the light of the findings of this conference, how the institutional setting of labor-

management relations should be modified to foster a more sound labor market policy.

So much for the reasoning behind the proposal contained in this joint resolution. Now, let me turn your attention for a few moments longer to some of the trends in employment in the main sectors of our economy. These trends constitute the background of the whole problem of unemployment.

There is an easy and somewhat blind acceptance of the notion that the growth of our economy will automatically result in full employment. While I subscribe to the need for accelerating economic growth to supply the wants of our people, to provide for our increasing defense requirements, and to provide more jobs for those able and willing to work, I do not think that economic growth per se spells full employment. Even if we were able to eliminate recessions, and thereby reach a level of about 5 percent annual increase in the output of goods and services, this might not carry with it full use of our labor force. Accelerated growth of production could be due entirely to a rise in per capita productivity, so that more goods and services would come from the same number of employed workers. In this case, with an increasing population and more people seeking work, the ranks of the unemployed would grow, too.

One important task of the proposed conference would be to determine what the forces of growth are in the economy and what effect they are likely to have on employment.

We are expecting a great increase in productivity from increasing automation and new technological installations. Prefabrication of housing is hardly out of its infancy, on-site construction even less so. The packaging and transportation of goods, the maintenance of transportation equipment and roadbeds, are only now beginning to use the new technologies. In clerical services enormous labor-saving installations and electronic systems have emerged from the experimental phase of development and are about to become as universal as the typewriter and telephone.

Spokesmen for labor unions have repeatedly declared themselves the champions of technological progress as the key to prosperity for everybody. But individual workers see their particular jobs stolen away by the machine, and fear that some among them will not get other comparably good jobs their employers told them were coming. Management on the other side is skeptical of labor's willingness to cooperate fully in installation of labor-saving equipment and systems.

Just so long as individual workers feel the pressure of unemployment, see and fear it, just so long will they be suspicious of those powerful new machines which rob them of their daily bread. So long as this condition exists, just so long will productivity lag, and consumers be denied the fullest gains of invention and innovations. The conference proposed by this joint resolution would seek to ascertain the extent and character of this problem, and ways to

solve it. The solution may rest in establishing a balance between the demand for and supply of labor through a satisfactory adjustment of the hours worked.

I said earlier that we must rely on the labor economists to produce the facts showing what is happening to particular occupational groups in different sectors of the economy. Here let me mention a few salient developments.

In our lifetime, we have seen agriculture, which was the mainstay of our society, the largest employer of people, a way of life for most Americans, change so rapidly as to become a secondary sector of the labor market. In 1958, agriculture provided jobs for about 6 million farmers, unpaid family workers and hired hands on the average. The figure was 7.5 million in 1950 and 9.5 million in 1940. This process of elimination of workers from agriculture does not show any signs of slowing down, as large farms replace family sized operations, and motor and electricity replace animal and manpower.

Making jobs average around 700,000 today; averaged 820,000 between 1952 and 1956; stood at 930,000 in the period 1947 to 1951. Absolutely nothing in sight, except for a vigorous expansion of Government-supported mining, will reverse this trend toward fewer and fewer workers employed in mining.

Building construction has been held out as a promising field for expansion of employment. But the facts indicate the reverse. The postwar peak was reached at 2.9 million workers in 1956, and demand for construction labor seems not destined to go above it. We are confronted here with an upsurge of do-it-yourself operations made easy by powered tools and prefabricated parts, but lessened employment is due primarily to the belated introduction of new heavy equipment on the site and prefabs of many kinds in the construction industry.

Manufacturing has been looked upon as the jobsaver, both because it employs such a large proportion of all workers and because it has been expanding so rapidly. But employment in manufacturing reached its alltime peak during World War II, in 1943 and 1944, when it totaled over 17 million. It shrank to 14.5 million during the demobilization in 1946, fluctuated with changing business conditions between 15.5 and 17 million thereafter, and now, as we climb out of the latest recession, is rising with exasperating slowness above 16 million. There is a shift within manufacturing itself which has prevented a decline in the total employment figures. But the trend in the demand for factory workers has been downward rather than upward since the end of the war.

What has been said about manufacturing is true with even greater emphasis for transportation and public utilities. While the demand for workers in these industries has not changed much since the war, the trend of employment is downward.

So, those industries which in the past have employed over half the labor force, and absorbed most of the new workers entering the labor force, are not able to provide new jobs now. Their goal is to